

1494
THE
CONDUCT
OF THE
DEAN of CORK,
R. Meade (W.)
AND OTHER
CLERGYMEN
OF THE SAME
DIOCESS,

In Relation to the Suit carried on against

Mr. *DALLAS*.

With an APPENDIX.

To which is Added,

A LETTER from the Rev. Archdeacon
Crofton, to the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of
Cork and Ross.

D U B L I N :

Printed by S. POWELL, in *Crane-lane*, 1750.

[Price Three-Pence.]



19th, of December, 1749.

ACTS had and made in the Chapter-house, of the Cathedral Church, of St. Finbarry's Cork, before the Reverend Mr. *William Meade*, Dean of the said Cathedral, and the undernamed Dignitaries and Prebendaries, assembled together in Chapter, in Presence of *Thomas Weekes* Notary Publick, Clerk to the said Dean and Chapters.

Mr. *Samuel Brome*, Chancellor.
 Mr. *John Smith*, Treasurer.
 Mr. *William Reader*, Archdeacon.
 Mr. *Boyle Davies*, Prebendary of *Liscleary*.
 Mr. *William Jackson*, Prebendary of *Cahirlag*.
 Mr. *Isaac Goldsmith*, Prebendary of *Killanully*.
 Mr. *Thomas White*, Prebendary of *Kilbrittain*.
 Mr. *Perkins Crofton*, Prebendary of *Desertmore*.
 Mr. *Samuel Wooderoffe*, Prebendary of *Dromdaleigue*.

On which Day the Dean, and several Members of this Chapter, having complained at this Chapter, that they apprehend themselves greatly injured by several Misrepresentations and Falsities, in a Pamphlet lately published, Intituled, *A Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocess of Cork, to his Friend in Dublin, relating the Conduct of the Bishop of Cork, in the Degradation of Mr. Dallas*; it was unanimously agreed, by the said Dean and the several Members of this Chapter present, that the said Dean, Archdeacon *Reader*, Dean *Goldsmith*, Prebendary of *Killanully*, the Reverend Mr. *Perkins Crofton*, Vicar-General and Prebendary of *Desertmore*, and the Reverend Mr. *Jackson*, Prebendary of *Cahirlag*, who are the Persons that complained, and think themselves aggrieved on this Occasion, ought, if possible, to justify their Conduct, by publishing each of them with their Names affixed, a true State of the Case, so far as each of them was concerned.

In pursuance of the above Act of Chapter, the Dean, and the four Members of the Chapter therein named, give the following Accounts of their Conduct, in Relation to the Suit carried on against Mr. *Dallas*.

The Case of *William Meade*, Dean of *Cork*, Relative to
Mr. *Dallas*.

IN a Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocese of *Cork*, to his Friend in *Dublin*, Relating the Conduct of the Bishop of *Cork*, in the Degradation of Mr. *Dallas*, there is a Relation of a Conversation (Pag. 8, 9.) between the Bishop of *Cork* and me, which is in some Part untrue, and in other Particulars greatly misrepresents the Truth; whereas, in Fact, the Conversation that passed between the Bishop and me, on that Occasion, and what followed thereon, is as follows, viz.

On Sunday the 5th of *March*, 1748-9 I was before Morning Service in the Vestry Room at St. *Finbarry's*, when the Bishop of *Cork*, being there putting on his Habit, beckoned to me, and took me aside to the Window, and privately asked me, what he should do with Mr. *Dallas*? I answered him, "That I really could not tell, that I feared he was too obstinate; That I never had much Conversation with him, but that I had advised him to submit to his Lordship's Judgment." Upon which his Lordship, lifting up his Hands and Eyes to Heaven, said, "Oh that he would! Oh that he would! it is the best Advice you could give him, and the only Way he could expect any Favour; for that he now was only Judge, and the Office Prosecutor; so that it may be in his Power to favour him; but that, if he appealed, he, the Bishop would be then Prosecutor; and the Court to which he appealed, (if he the said *Dallas* should be Cast) could not pronounce any Sentence against him, but that of Degradation, prescribed by the Canon." The Bishop further said, "that it was never in his Inclination or Intention to hurt Mr. *Dallas*; and that notwithstanding all the Trouble and Expence, that Mr. *Dallas* had put him to; yet (he thanked God) his former Disposition, was no way altered: But yet, if he did forgive him, he could never have a good Opinion of him, but that he was a Man of an evil Mind." Finding his Lordship in this Disposition, I told his Lordship, "if he would permit me, I would endeavour once more to persuade him to submit." To which his Lordship said, "if you do, let it be by some Body else, for if you should speak yourself, he will certainly vex you." To which I answered, "he could not vex me, for if he did not take my Advice, I should be contented." And so the Conversation for that Time ended; which would never have happened between the Bishop and me on that Occasion,
had

had not the Bishop first mentioned Mr. *Dallas* to me, as I had no Intention to speak on that Subject, so little anxious was I about Mr. *Dallas*, notwithstanding what the Clergyman's Letter insinuates.

In Consequence of the above Conversation, the very same Day after Evening Prayer, I went to the Reverend Mr. *Peter Bristow's* Room; when and where I told him of the above Conversation I had with the Bishop; and desired he would tell Mr. *Dallas*, what just Reason he had to submit, and upon Submission to expect Favour. But this Mr. *Bristow* refused to do.

Next Morning I went to *Bishopstown*, (where Sir *John Freke* resides) to dine with him; and told him the above Conversation I had with the Bishop, and said, "I was sorry I had not seen Mr. *Dallas*." Upon which Lady *Freke*, who was then present, told me, "that Mr. *Dallas* was to dine there that Day, and that I should have an Opportunity of speaking to him," which I accordingly then had, and told him, "what Grounds I had to think, that if he did submit, it would be of Service to him." Mr. *Dallas* asked me, if I would be answerable for the Consequences? I told him, "I would not, nor could not," but informed him of the Disposition I found the Bishop in, and what he said upon that Subject; and left him to judge, whether or no, what I told him, was sufficient Grounds to induce him to submit; he said he would consider.

Accordingly on *Tuesday*, the Day following being Court-day, Mr. *Dallas* did submit, as I am informed; induced thereto, as I verily believe, by the Motives, I then, and there proposed to him.

On *Saturday, March* the 11th, I came to *Cork*, and was surprized at a Report I heard, that upon Mr. *Dallas's* Submission the *Tuesday* before, the Bishop had ordered a Sentence of Degradation to be drawn up in Form against him, and had employed two Lawyers to have it drawn in the most effectual Manner.

As I imagined, his Submission proceeded intirely from the Inducements I had laid before him, I was greatly alarmed; and on *Sunday* the 12th, I went to Church, where I expected to meet the Bishop, and intended to speak to him about it. The Bishop was there, but seemed studiously to avoid any Conversation with me, so that I had not an Opportunity of speaking to him that Day.

On *Monday* the 13th, I went to Church, where I met the Bishop again, but he endeavoured to avoid me as before, by
leaving

leaving the Church without going into the Vestry-Room, as usual. But being resolved to speak to him, I followed him, and over-took him in the Church-yard. I told his Lordship, “ that I was greatly surprized, after Mr. *Dallas* had submitted at my Instance, and the Assurances I had from his Lordship, to hear, that his Lordship was determined to proceed to Sentence of Degradation against him, and that he had employed Lawyers to draw up the Sentence in Form.” I walked with him to Bishop’s Court, and went with him to his Closet, where being sat down, he said, “ it was true that he had ordered the Sentence to be drawn up ; that he owed a great deal to his own Character ; that he had been Advertised by his Friends in *Dublin*, that, if he did not make an Example of Mr. *Dallas*, he would be despised, as if foiled by him : And pulled out a Paper, and read a Paragraph to that Purpose : Nevertheless he thanked God, he hoped he had found out a Method, to reconcile it to his own Mind ; that he intended to be at Court, *Friday* the 31st of *March*, and desired I would be there that Day ; for Mr. *Dallas* was cited to attend ; and that, tho’ the usual Way, was for the Proctor or Register to tender the Sentence to the Judge, who, if upon Perusal he approved of it, was to pronounce it ; that instead of this Method, he on that Occasion would order the Register to read it, and then lay it aside to another Court-day ; that for this Purpose, he had ordered it so, that the Visitation should intervene before the next Court-day : That at the Visitation he should speak something, touching Mr. *Dallas*’s Offence ; and if his Brethren, the Clergy, would interpose in Mr. *Dallas*’s Favour, he would find some Expedient to stop farther Prosecution.” Not doubting, but the Clergy would so interpose, I declared myself content with the Manner of Proceeding. But as I was taking leave of his Lordship, I desired to know, “ What manner of Submission Mr. *Dallas* was to make, he said Mr. *Dallas* might draw it up, as he thought proper, so that he acknowledged his Offence, expressed his Concern for it, and particularly disclaimed the Doctrine he had advanced, of not being subject to the Jurisdiction of the Diocess where he resided.”

These two are the only private Conversations, I have had with the Bishop on this Subject ; and what enables me to be so particular, at this distance of Time, is, that I reduced the Substance of these Conversations into Writing, while the Thing was fresh in my Memory.

The last Conversation, (for what Reasons I cannot tell) the

the Letter-Writer has not related the Particulars of; but he has referred to it, (Pag. 18,) in the Relation of a Conversation said to have passed between the Bishop and me in Court, *March 31st*, in Manner following, to wit, after the Bishop had ordered Mr. *Dallas* to be called, and upon his not appearing, he had ordered the Register to read the Sentence of Degradation, and had then declared that he would meet the Clergy at Visitation before next Court-day. The Bishop then, having put the Affair upon this Footing, is represented by the Letter-Writer, as turning to the Dean, and desiring him to declare, "Whether he, the Bishop, had not acted up to the utmost, the Dean could possibly expect from any Hint, he had even given about the Matter; and whether, he had not observed to a Tittle the Process, he told him he resolved to observe that Day?" to which the Dean is made to say, "you have my Lord." The Answer that I in reality made, was, "you have my Lord so far." And any one I think may easily observe, from the last aforesaid private Conversation I had with the Bishop, that I meant no more by this Answer to the Bishop's Question, than this, that he had observed the Process, he told me before, he would take that Day. And I own, I was in great Hopes he would have pursued the same to the End.

As to what passed the Day of Visitation, all that I think myself concerned to take Notice of, is the Declaration that I then made of my Opinion of Mr. *Dallas's* Offence, and the Punishment he ought to undergo. When the Bishop proposed that the Clergy should declare their Opinions, and first applied to me, for mine; I own I said that Mr. *Dallas* could not deny, but that he had committed a Fault, and ought to acknowledge it. But being asked by Dean *Goldsmith*, whether I meant, that Mr. *Dallas* had been guilty of a Fault, for which he ought to be Degraded? I replied, No, I think he ought not to be Degraded. Whereupon the Bishop asked no more Opinions, but got up and said, he wanted no more Opinions, that he knew the Law, and what he had to do, and so adjourned the Visitation. I then being next to him, before he went out of Court, (where the Visitation was held) told his Lordship there were some Expressions so severe in the Submission required of Mr. *Dallas*, that he could not possibly sign it, but begged his Lordship to mollify them, and I was sure Mr. *Dallas* would agree to make it. To which he answered, he would not abate one Tittle of it, and so went out of Court.

As to the long Conversation, introduced by the Letter-Writer,

Writer, between the Bishop and me, towards the close of the Visitation, I cannot charge my Memory, that such Conversation passed between us at the Time mentioned. But this I am certain of, he makes me say, many Things, which I could not possibly say, being quite inconsistent with my Sentiments of the Matter.

Thus have I been the unhappy Instrument of leading Mr. *Dallas* to his Ruin ; but this is the only Satisfaction I have, that I did not intend to injure him, the Steps I took being entirely owing, to my being deceived myself. Given under my Hand this 23d Day of *December*, 1749.

William Meade, Dean of *Cork*.

The Behaviour of the Reverend *William Reader*, Archdeacon of *Cork*, the Reverend Dean *Goldsmith*, Prebendary of *Killanulla*, and the Reverend *William Jackson*, Prebendary of *Cabirlag*, at the Visitation of *Cork*, April the 12th, 1749, relating to the Affair of Mr. *Dallas*, truly and fairly represented ; with Observations on the false and unfair Account, of their Conduct on this Occasion, given by the Author of *A Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocese of Cork, to his Friend in Dublin, Relating the Conduct of the Bishop of Cork, in the Degradation of Mr. Dallas*.

IN a Pamphlet lately published, intituled, *A Letter from a Clergyman, &c.* There is an Account given (Pag. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.) of an Opposition made to the Opinion of the Bishop, and several of the Clergy, at the Visitation of *Cork*, in Relation to the Affair of Mr. *Dallas*, by three Clergymen ; as also of the Sentiments of the rest of the Clergy present, of what was said and done, by these three Clergymen.

The three Persons there pointed at, are known to be Archdeacon *Reader*, Dean *Goldsmith*, and Mr. *Jackson*, who are introduced in that Letter, as speaking in the Order that I have mentioned them here.

The Substance of the Account given by the Letter-Writer of this Affair, is as follows, viz.

That at the Visitation of *Cork*, Mr. *Dallas* attended as a School-master, desired to be heard, and offered to make an Acknowledgment before the Clergy about Mr. *Oliver's* Marriage, according to a Form drawn up by himself ; which was rejected by the Bishop as insufficient ; and thereupon another Form of Submission was produced, which the Bishop declared his Approbation of, and made use of several Arguments, to induce Mr. *Dallas* to make and Sign that Submission,

Submission : but this Mr. *Dallas* refused to do. Upon this, according to the Letter-Writer, several of the Clergy, rose up and said, sure it cannot be said, that Mr. *Dallas* hath not broke the Law, and if so, the least he can do, is to acknowledge it. Mr. Dean, say they, you are our Chief here, under the Bishop, and you ought to speak for us, on which the Dean rose up, and earnestly said to Mr. *Dallas*, surely Mr. *Dallas*, you cannot say, you have not transgressed the Law, and surely you ought to own you have done so.

On this three Clergymen are represented, as rising up, one after another ; as disallowing the Dean's Authority to speak for them, and afterwards declaring their own Opinions, viz. in Substance, that Mr. *Dallas*'s Crime did not appear to them, to be of such a Nature, as deserved, or (at least in Prudence) ought to be punished by Degradation.

After the Bishop had answered these Clergymen, severally, as they spoke, he is made in the End, to answer them upon the whole, " That he had not desired their Advice, as " to the Punishment Mr. *Dallas* deserved, &c. but that, " however, since any Opinions, had been (though unasked) " given in this Point, he desired, that if any of the Rest " of the Clergy, agreed in Sentiments with them, that " they would declare it ; and this he repeated again, but " no one said any Thing." After which the Bishop is supposed by the Letter-Writer, to make a Speech, and to have Conversations in Publick with the Dean and Mr. *Dallas*, which take up near four Pages of the printed Letter, (Page 25, 26, 27, 28.) and then the Bishop lamented the Necessity he was under, in order to vindicate the Law, and for the Peace of his Diocese, to proceed to Sentence ; and so the Visitation was adjourned.

This is the Substance of the Account of our Behaviour given by the Letter from a Gentleman, &c. But the true State of the Case, and which we are ready to justify, is as follows.

At the Visitation of *Cork*, April the 12th, 1749, after Mr. *Dallas* had been called, as a School-matter, and appeared, he offered a Form of Submission, which he declared himself willing to make, in the most publick Manner ; the Substance of which was, that he acknowledged the Fact, with which he was charged, expressed in a solemn Manner, his Concern for the Offence, he had given the Bishop and Clergy thereby ; and promised never to offend in the same Manner again.

The Bishop then assigned several Reasons, why he could not pardon Mr. *Dallas* on such a Submission.

After this the Reverend Doctor *Browne* (as we remember) produced a Form of Submission, which the Bishop approved of. In this Submission, Mr. *Dallas* among other Things was required, to acknowledge that in what he had done, he had been guilty of a very great Crime, for which he deserved to be degraded.

The Bishop then said a great deal, to induce Mr. *Dallas* to make this Submission, and particularly said, that Mr. *Dallas*, had no other Way to save himself from Ruin, but by making this Submission; for that, if he did not make it, he was resolved to Degradate him.

Notwithstanding this, Mr. *Dallas* persisted in refusing to make that Submission, and assigned his Reasons why he could not submit to make it; which as it appeared to us, were to this Effect; that as he was not conscious to himself, that he had been guilty of any Crime, for which he deserved to be Degraded, therefore he could not agree to make a Submission, in which, he was to declare a Thing, that he in his Conscience, did not believe to be true; that as he in his own Mind, believed himself innocent of such a Crime, he had rather be Degraded, than confess (what seemed to him a Falshood) that he deserved it. He declared himself open to Conviction; but that he was not satisfied, by the Arguments hitherto used by the Bishop.

Upon this, Dean *Meade*, Doctor *Browne*, and Mr. *Waterhouse*, severally pressed Mr. *Dallas*, to make the Submission. The Substance of their Arguments, as appears to us, may be summed up in these Words, "Surely Mr. *Dallas*, you cannot say, you have not transgressed the Law, "and surely you ought to own you have done so."

After they had thus, in vain, tried to prevail on Mr. *Dallas*, having used for this Purpose, no other Argument, than what the Bishop had made use of before, Dean *Meade*, then rose up and said, Mr. *Dallas*, it is the Opinion of the Clergy, that you ought to make the Submission required.

Upon this Declaration of Dean *Meade*, Archdeacon *Reader*, Dean *Goldsmith*, and Mr. *Jackson*, who before this happened, had no Thoughts of speaking at all, then thought themselves called upon to declare that they had given no such Authority to the Dean, to declare their Opinions: and that, what the Dean had said, was the Opinion of the Clergy, was, at least not agreeable to their Sentiments, which

which they now thought themselves obliged publickly to declare. Upon which they rose up one after another, disallowed the Dean's Authority to speak for them, and afterwards delivered their own Opinions, *viz.* in Substance, that they thought Mr. *Dallas* had been guilty of a very great Irregularity, for which he deserved to be punished, but that his Crime did not appear to them, to be of such a heinous Nature, as deserved, or (at least in Prudence) ought to be punished by Degradation.

After the Bishop had answered these Clergymen, severally as they spoke, the Bishop then in the End desired the Clergy present, severally to give their Opinions: And then applied to Dean *Meade*, as the first, in order to give his Opinion. Upon which, the Dean said, that in his Opinion, Mr. *Dallas* ought to make the Submission required, but Dean *Meade* being desired by Archdeacon *Reader*, to speak plainly, so that his Meaning might not be liable, to be mistaken, and being immediately called upon by Dean *Goldsmith* to declare, whether it was his Opinion, that Mr. *Dallas* ought to be Degraded, if he did not make the Submission required, Dean *Meade* said publickly, that he did not think, that he ought to be Degraded.

After this Declaration of Dean *Meade*, the Bishop did not think proper to ask any more of the Clergy their Opinions: Nor did any of them say any Thing, contrary to the Opinion, thus declared, by Dean *Meade*, Archdeacon *Reader*, Dean *Goldsmith*, and Mr. *Jackson*. Upon which, the Bishop, in a few Words, as we apprehend, declared his Dislike, of what had passed, and lamented the Necessity he was under of degrading Mr. *Dallas*; and so the Visitation was adjourned.

Whoever is willing to be at the Trouble, of considering and comparing, these two different Accounts of the same Affair, must observe, that though they agree, as to several Facts; yet, that they differ widely, as to two most material Points, that is, the Occasion of our rising up to speak, and the Sense of the Rest of the Clergy, of what we said on this Occasion. And we think we have great Reason to complain of the Author of a Letter from a Clergyman, &c. on this Account, that he has related our Behaviour, and that of the Clergy present, in a false and unfair Manner, so that a Person who is inclined to give Credit to what he says, might easily be led to think, not only that we gave our Opinions unasked, but also that we shewed a Forwardness to oppose our Bishop, by officiously thrusting ourselves into

an Affair, that did not concern us ; and that what we said, was in Effect contradicted, by the rest of our Brethren then present. It is merely on this Account to clear ourselves, from this unworthy Imputation, thus attempted to be fastened on us, that we give either the Publick, or ourselves the Trouble of this Account.

The Occasion of our rising up to speak, described by the Letter from a Clergyman, &c. is this, that several Clergymen said to Mr. Dean *Meade*, " Mr. Dean you are our Chief here under the Bishop, and you ought to speak for us, on which the Dean rose up, and very earnestly said to Mr. *Dallas*, surely Mr. *Dallas*, you cannot say, you have not transgressed the Law, and surely you ought to own you have done so." These Words of the Dean are said to be what provoked us to speak, now really it is very extraordinary, that we should be so readily provoked at these Words, especially as we are confident that we had heard the Substance of them, related at least half a dozen Times, in the Course of what had been said on the Affair that Day, and besides it hath a very odd Appearance, both from what several of the Clergy are made by the Letter-Writer to desire of the Dean, to wit, that he should speak for them ; as well as from what Archdeacon *Reader* is made to say, in Answer to the Dean, to wit, that he had no Right to speak for the Clergy ; to suppose that the Dean, should have said no more on this Occasion, than what had been frequently said that Day before, and had hitherto been unnoticed.

The Truth of the Case then is this, that in the short Account given by the Letter-Writer of this Affair, there are two notorious Falshoods, or if you please, gross Misrepresentations. The first is, that several of the Clergy are made to say to the Dean, Mr. Dean, you are our Chief, here under the Bishop, and ought to speak for us. For we take upon ourselves to say, that if several of the Clergy said any such Thing, it must have been in Whispers, or in some such Way, that neither we, nor the Generality of the Clergy present, did, or could hear them say any such Thing: And we are the more confident of this, because we are certain that, if we had heard any such Thing, we should immediately have desired leave to speak our own Opinions, as we did after Dean *Meade* had spoke: And since this Pamphlet came out, we have applied to Numbers of Persons present, who all declared, that they did not hear any such Thing said by several of the Clergy ; and what makes this, if possible, still more strong is, that when Dean *Meade*

Meade was charged, as having spoken without Authority, in the name of the Clergy, neither he nor any Body else, did on that Occasion, mention in his Vindication, his having any such Authority given him by several of the Clergy, which we think must naturally have been said, if any such Thing had passed, about a Minute before.

The second Falshood or Misrepresentation is, that Dean *Meade*, is made to say on this Occasion, "surely Mr. *Dallas*, you cannot say, you have not transgressed the Law, and surely you ought to own you have done so," for if the Dean, did at all make use of these Words, at that Time, which in our Opinion he did not, this at least, we are certain of, that he did also at that Time say, Mr. *Dallas* it is the Opinion of the Clergy, that you ought to make the Submission required; and that it was merely upon his saying these Words, and no other, that we rose up and spoke. For the Truth of this, we can safely appeal to Dean *Meade* himself, as well as many other Persons present.

For when the Dean made this Declaration, as we were sensible, that we had given no such Authority to Dean *Meade*, to declare our Opinion, we thought ourselves under a Necessity, either of allowing by our Silence, that the Dean had spoken our Thoughts of the Affair, or else of declaring in the same publick Manner, that what the Dean had said was the Opinion of the Clergy, was not at least agreeable to our Sentiments, and therefore we rose up (not as the Letter-Writer expresses it, provoked at the Dean, but urged by the Declaration, which the Dean had made) to clear ourselves from having the Imputation fastened on us, of our having thought, that Mr. *Dallas* ought to be pressed to do that, which he apprehended to be contrary to Truth, and the Judgment of his own Conscience, and to shew farther, that we were so far from being of that Opinion, that on the contrary, we thought that Degradation was too severe a Punishment for Mr. *Dallas*'s Fault, and if we really thought so, no Body could in Reason expect from us, that we should join in pressing Mr. *Dallas*, to make a Submission, in which he was to confess, that he was guilty of a Crime, for which he deserved to be degraded.

This is a true and fair Account of the Reasons of our speaking at all unasked, and of our saying what we did, which as we apprehend, puts out Conduct on this Occasion, in a very different Light, from what it is put in by the Falshoods and Misrepresentation of the Author of *A Letter from*

from a Clergyman, &c. those who were present will be able to judge of the Truth of what we assert, and if in acting, as we have related it, we shall be thought by the Publick to have acted unwarrantably, we must patiently submit to their Censure.

The other Point which we complain of as related by the Author of the Letter, in a false and unfair Manner, is the Sense of the Clergy present, of what we said on this Occasion, for the Manner in which he relates it, is this, that after we had spoken, the Bishop then desired, “ that if any “ of the Rest of the Clergy agreed in Sentiments with “ them, that they would declare it, and this he repeated “ again, but no one said any Thing.” Whereas the Truth is notoriously known, by a great Number of Persons present, to be as we have related it in the State of our Case ; to wit, “ that the Bishop desired the Clergy present, severally to give their Opinions, and then applied to Dean “ *Meade*, as the first in order to give his Opinion. Upon “ which the Dean said, that in his Opinion, Mr. *Dallas* “ ought to make the Submission required. But Dean *Meade* “ being desired by Archdeacon *Reader*, to speak plainly, so “ that his Meaning might not be liable to be mistaken, “ and being immediately called upon by Dean *Goldsmith*, “ to declare, whether it was his Opinion, that Mr. *Dallas* “ ought to be Degraded, if he did not make the Submission required, Dean *Meade* said publicly, that he “ did not think that he ought to be degraded.” After this Declaration of Dean *Meade*’s, the Bishop did not think it proper to ask any more of the Clergy, their Opinions, nor did any of them say any Thing, contrary to the Opinion, thus declared by Dean *Meade*, Archdeacon *Reader*, Dean *Goldsmith*, and Mr. *Jackson*.

As the Account here given by us, of these two Points, in which we materially differ, from the Author of a Letter from a Clergyman, &c. is grounded on Facts, which all passed in a most publick Manner, we must Appeal again for the Truth of what we say to the Bishop, the Clergy, and the other Persons present. And as to those that have not an Opportunity of satisfying themselves by consulting a sufficient Number of those, who were Ear-witnesses of what passed, we flatter ourselves, that they will not entertain Opinions, to the Prejudice of our Characters, on the bare Assertions of a Pamphlet, published without a Name ; when we ourselves, by having published this Account with our Names affixed, have staked our Credit upon the Truth of what we say.

All

All that we think proper to be further observed by us here, is, that Archdeacon *Reader*, and Dean *Goldsmith* do not think it necessary to dispute with the Author of the Letter, the particular Expressions, which are put by him into their Mouths, because they do not think them very exceptionable in themselves, and cannot pretend at this distance of Time, to be particular, as to the very Words, which they made use of. All that they are willing to observe, is that they have some Reason to complain of the Disingenuity of the Letter-Writer, for suppressing some of the most material Parts of what they said, and delivering the Rest in harsher Language than they made use of.

But as to Mr. *Jackson*, he thinks himself most grossly abused by this Author, and therefore thinks himself obliged in a separate Manner to publish the Substance of what he said as far as he can recollect it on this Occasion, in so many Months after the Thing had happened.

Given under our Hands this 23^d

Day of *December*, 1749.

William Reader,
Isaac Goldsmith,
William Jackson.

IN a Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocese of *Cork*, to his Friend in *Dublin*, &c. I am represented (Page 24, 25.) as expressing my self in the following absurd Manner, "that for my Part, I could only say in the Matter, "that I was present when the Archbishop of *Dublin*, gave "the same Direction to his Clergy, and they did not mind "what he said," If these Words, thus abruptly introduced, can be supposed to have any Meaning, it must be to spirit up the Clergy of *Cork*, to oppose their Bishop, from the like Behaviour of the Clergy of *Dublin*; which Design, was so contrary to my real Thoughts, that I think it is impossible that I could utter Words, which would bear such a Meaning.

As to the Occasion of my speaking at all, I must refer to the foregoing Account, but though I cannot at this distance of Time, pretend to recollect the very Words I then made use of, yet I will be positive, as to the Substance of them, which was this; that I had heard that the late Archbishop of *Dublin*, had given the like Directions to his Clergy, but finding the Observance and Execution of them, attended with many Difficulties and Inconveniences, they
were

were afterwards not insisted on, and the Practice continued as usual. In justice to my self, as well as the Clergy of the Diocess of *Dublin*, I have thought it necessary to say thus much, and hope they will not think me capable of making so false a Representation of them, or so indecent, and absurd a Speech, as that which I am charged with in the said Letter; otherwise I should not have thought worth my while to have taken this particular Notice of the Words, falsely attributed to me, as there were present so many Witnesses of what I said.

Given under my Hand, this 23d
Day of *December*, 1749.

William Jackson.

I Had prepared for the Press, what I thought necessary to publish, on this Occasion; but for certain Reasons, which have occurred since, I hope the Dean and Chapter will excuse my Silence; at least till I receive an Answer to a Letter, which I have written to the Bishop of *Cork* on this Affair.

Perkins Crofton.

Cork, *December* the
28th, 1749.

APPEN-

APPENDIX

To the CONDUCT of the Dean
of CORK, and other CLERGY-
MEN, &c.

WHEREAS a Pamphlet was publish'd in *Cork*, *December* the 30th, Intituled, the Conduct of the Dean of *Cork*, and other Clergymen, &c. in which among other Things we give an Account under our Hands, of our Behaviour at the Visitation of *Cork*, *April* the 12th, 1749. which Account was published in Pursuance of an Act of Chapter, made the 19th of *December*, 1749. We think it proper to inform the Bishop and the Public, that neither at the Time the above Act of Chapter was made, nor at the Time that this our Account was finished for the Press, which was *December* the 23d. had we the least Reason to believe, that the Bishop of *Cork* would avow himself to be the Author of a Letter Intituled, a Letter from a Clergyman, &c. but on the Contrary, we thought we had convincing Reasons to persuade us, that he could not be the Author of it.

The first Reason was, that we apprehended, that there were several Passages in the said Pamphlet, which seemed to insinuate, that the Clergy of the Diocess of *Cork*, were a Set of Men, who were likely to celebrate Marriages contrary to Law, unless deterred from doing it, by being laid under Restrictions, which are not thought necessary in other Diocesses.

The Second Reason is drawn from several Passages in the Letter from a Clergyman, &c. in which the Author speaketh in such a Manner, as seemed to us not reconcileable with the Supposition, that the Bishop was the Author of the said Pamphlet, particularly (p. 12, 13, 14. according to the *Dublin* Edition of a Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) there is a Relation of a Conversation between the Author and the Bishop, which seemed to us most plainly to shew,
C that

that the Bishop, and the Author must be two different Persons.

However strong these and other Reasons appeared to us then, it now appeareth, that we were mistaken, since the Bishop hath been pleased to acknowledge himself the Author of it, by an Advertisement published, as we are informed, late on the Evening of the 27th of *December*, before our Account was made Publick, which was not till the Noon of *December* the 30th.

We with the Bishop, had prevented this Mistake, by putting his Name to the Pamphlet, at the Time of its Publication, or by letting the Clergy know, by some other Method, that he was the Author of it; for, in this Case, we should have thought ourselves obliged, to have first applied to the Bishop, before we printed any Thing on this Occasion; and if we had thought ourselves, laid under a Necessity, of appealing to the Publick, by the Bishop's refusing to Redress us on this Application, we should then have thought it incumbent on us, to make use of no Expression, which might be deemed improper from Clergymen to their Bishop, on such an Occasion. And we should probably have done no more, than published a plain State of the Case, and left it to the Publick, to make their Observations on it. But, as by Mistake, we have been drawn into another Method, of answering (as we supposed) the Author of an Anonymous Pamphlet; we think ourselves obliged, in Justice to our Characters, and to prevent the Mistakes of others, to give the Bishop and the Publick this Account of our Proceeding, which, we hope will be sufficient, to convince all candid Persons, that tho' we insist on the Truth of what we assert in the Account already published by us, we had no Design, by any Expressions, that we have there made use of, to treat our Bishop in a disrespectful Manner. And we hope, that if any Persons shall think proper, without consulting us, to re-print the Conduct of the Dean of *Cork*, and other Clergymen, &c. that they will publish this by Way of Appendix to it. Given under our Hands this 4th Day of *January*, 1749.

William Reader,

Isaac Goldsmith.

Note, That we had no Opportunity of consulting Dean *Meade* and Mr. *Jackson*, on our publishing the above Account, as they are at some Distance in the Country. If we had, we have no Reason to doubt, but that they would have joined us in this Account, given of our Conduct.

A LETTER from the
Rev'd. Archdeacon CROFTON, to the
Rt. Rev'd. the LORD BISHOP of
CORK and ROSS.

P R E F A C E.

I Had no Intent to publish any thing at present, farther than the Advertisement publish'd in my Name in Dublin, which I thought absolutely necessary at that Time: But having since seen an Advertisement, publish'd by the Bishop of Cork: In which he acknowledges himself to be the Author of a Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocese of Cork, to his Friend in Dublin, relating the Conduct of the Bishop of Cork, in the Degradation of Mr. Dallas: To which is added, a Certificate, signed by the Reverend Thomas Millerd, the Rev'd. St. John Brown, and the Rev'd. Samuel Brome; declaring that the Conversation between the Bishop and the Vicar-General in the Vestry Room of the Cathedral Church of St. Finbary, Cork, the Day on which Mr. Dallas was degraded, is faithfully and impartially related in pag. 29, 30, 31. of a Pamphlet printed in Dublin, intitled, a Letter from a Clergyman, &c. and that the Words there said to be spoke by the Bishop and Vicar General, are to the best of their Recollection, the Words us'd by each of them, I thought it incumbent on me to write the following Letter to the Bishop of Cork, to which I received this verbal Answer by my Servant, "That his Lordship's Answer was already in Print." From whence I concluded that his Lordship chose that I should Address my Defence to the Publick: And as the first Step, I publish a true Copy of the Letter I wrote to his Lordship, except one Paragraph, which I have purposely omitted, as it relates to a private Conversation between his Lordship and me, and is marked in its proper Place by a Chasm.

Cork, December 28th, 1749.

My Lord,

HA V I N G seen an Advertisement, dated *Cork*, December 26th, and published the 27th, wherein your *Lordship* declares yourself to be the Author of a Letter from a Clergyman, &c. after which follows a Certificate, signed by Mr. *Millerd*, Doctor *Browne* and Mr. *Brome*, attesting, the Relation (in the Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) of the Conversation that passed between your *Lordship* and me, in the Vestry of St. *Barry's*, *Corke*, to be a faithful and impartial Relation of the Words there said to be spoke by the *Bishop* and me.

Now, this is to assure your *Lordship*, that had I known you to be the Author of that Letter, or that the *Gentlemen* who signed said Certificate, would have attested what is therein set forth, I should have begun the Vindication of my Character, (which I imagine is struck at in the Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) by first applying to your *Lordship* for Redress.

As I could not take this Step sooner, for the Reason above mentioned, I hope it will not be thought yet too late, for me to apply to your *Lordship*, to do me Justice, and on this Confidence beg Leave, to endeavour to convince your *Lordship*, that the Conversation, which passed between your *Lordship* and me, in the Vestry Room of St. *Barry's* is greatly misrepresented, by the Letter from a Clergyman, &c. and I am apt to flatter myself, with hopes of Success on this Occasion, as I imagine, that it must be agreeable to your *Lordship*, to prevent by all proper Means, Disputes in Publick, between Clergymen contradicting each other.

I therefore proceed to lay the whole of this Case before your *Lordship*; which, I hope may be a Means of making your *Lordship*, and the other *Gentlemen*, recollect some Particulars of our Conversation, which are omitted by the
Letter

Letter from a Clergyman, &c. and of setting in their true Light, other Matters, which seem to me misrepresented in the said Letter.

I begin with acknowledging that your *Lordship*, asked me “ *whether I thought it was in your Power to pronounce any Sentence in Mr. Dallas’s Case, but that of Degradation on ?* ” To which I answer’d, “ *that I thought you could,* ” and at the same Time, gave my Reason for making this Answer ; which tho’ not mentioned in the Letter, &c. was as follows, “ *that as the new Articles exhibited against Mr. Dallas, were at large, and not confined to a particular Canon, as the first Articles were, you might on this account, inflict any other Canonical Censure ; particularly I said, that he might be Silenced.* ” To which your *Lordship* made an Objection, as in the Letter, &c. “ *that he was silenced before he committed the Crime.* ” I then immediately said, “ *that he might be Suspended.* ”

The next Question, put to me by your *Lordship*, according to the Letter from a Clergyman, &c. is, “ *whether Suspension, would extend beyond your own Diocess,* ” to which I am made to answer, “ *that it would not,* ” “ *here, my Lord, I must beg Leave to say, that my Answer was directly the contrary ;* ” “ *that, it would extend to other Diocesses.* ” And, I further said, “ *that I was sure, no Bishop would suffer any Man to Officiate in his Diocess, on whom such a Sentence had passed.* ” This was my Opinion then, and afterwards in all Companies, where I had any Conversation, on this Subject, I declared it to be my Opinion : And particularly, when Counsellor *Crips*, gave it, as his Opinion (as mention’d in the Letter, &c.) that his Suspension would not extend, beyond his own Diocess ; I then told him, that he had given an unwarrantable, and imprudent Opinion ; for I apprehended, that what he had said, was not agreeable to Law ; and that, by his thus lessening the Force of Suspension, he might bring on his Client, the Sentence of *Degradation*.

And if your *Lordship* pleases to recollect, that when you asked Mr. *Jackson* (in your passing to the Court) the same Question, about the Extent of Suspension, and he answered, that it would not extend beyond your own Diocess ; you then said, that he had given the same Opinion with Mr. *Crips*. If your *Lordship* had then thought that I had given the same Opinion, it is probable, I apprehend, that you would have mention’d it. But I was so far from having given your *Lordship*, any Grounds to say the same of me,
that

that I afterwards blamed Mr. *Jackson*, for so hastily giving an Opinion, which seemed to me, both imprudent and ill founded.

I mention all these Particulars, in hopes your *Lordship* may recollect from them, the Truth of my Answer ; and that I have therefore cause to complain of the Answer, which I am made to give in a Letter from a Clergyman, &c.

The next Question said, (in the Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) to be asked me by your *Lordship*, is, "*how Suspension differed from Silencing?*" "This Question was indeed (tho' not on the Occasion, mentioned by the Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) put to me by your *Lordship*, in the Course of our Conversation : And when you asked me this Question, I was so far from not answering it, as represented in the Letter, &c. that, on the contrary, I answered to this Question of your *Lordship's*," "*That in my Opinion, the Difference between them was this, that silencing would only reach to your own Diocess, but that Suspension would reach to other Diocesses.*"

The next Question, proposed to me, by the Bishop (according to the Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) is, "*Whether he could appoint Mr. Dallas to read in the Church, a Confession of his Guilt ; and in Case he refused it, how the Bishop could enforce it.*" To this I am made to say, "*That I could not Answer, but that I seemed still of Opinion, that if Mr. Dallas was silenced, it would only extend to this Diocess.*"

As to my Reason for declining to give an Answer to this Question, I must here assure your *Lordship*, that it was merely owing to my great Caution ; lest in speaking my Opinion, I might say any thing, that might divert your *Lordship* from inflicting any other Canonical Censure, milder than that of *Degradation* : Which I was in hopes, you were inclined to do, from the Questions proposed to me. As to what follows, "*That I seemed still of Opinion, that Silencing, would extend only to the same Diocess* : This is certainly true, if you consider Silencing, as differing from Suspension : But the Letter from a Clergyman, &c. seems here to insinuate, that by Silencing, I meant the same thing as Suspension ; as is plain from the Argument, that your *Lordship* is made to make use of on that Occasion, in the following Words, to wit, "*That if a Clergyman was suspended for a Crime, he was suspended from the Exercise of his Office, in any Part of the Christian Church.*" Which Words

Words tend only to shew, that what I said, only with Regard to Silencing, was not true with Regard to Suspension: Whereas, if your *Lordship* had understood me rightly, you must have contradicted me, by saying, that a Clergyman silenced for a Crime, in one Diocese, was thereby silenced in every other Part of the Christian Church.

In Consequence of the Conversation, which I had with your *Lordship*, as mentioned above, I am represented, as desired by your *Lordship*, “ to go to Counsellor *Crips*, and ask his Opinion, to satisfy myself ;” this Account, I cannot possibly agree to, for I did not want at all, to be satisfied myself ; and be pleased to recollect, my *Lord*, that when you desired me, to ask Mr. *Crips*’s Opinion, I declined it, as not wanting his Opinion, to confirm mine ; and did not go to him, till, your *Lordship* insisted on it, and the Reason of my Backwardness was, that I feared as he had not time to consider the Questions proposed to him, and the Tendency of them, with Regard to his Client, he might possibly give an Answer contrary to mine ; which by lessening the extent of Suspension, or not allowing your *Lordship*, a Right of inflicting other Penance, might contribute to produce a Sentence of Degradation.

As to the Message, said (in the Letter from a Clergyman, &c.) to be deliver’d from Counsellor *Crips* to your *Lordship*, to wit, “ *that if you pronounced Sentence, you should be Attached.*” This Message I utterly disclaim ; for the Message that I received from Counsellor *Crips*, and which I delivered immediately after to your *Lordship* was, “ *that I should tell your Lordship in his Name, that he would move to have the Submission withdrawn, and if this was refused him, that he would apply to the Court of King’s Bench, to have the Bishop Attached.*” This is the Message which I am ready to swear, (when properly called upon) that I received from Mr. *Crips*, and that I afterwards delivered to your *Lordship*.

I hope it will be granted, that I might be supposed able to carry so short a Message, a very few Yards ; and that I cannot be suspected of any Intention to alter the Message delivered to me, especially as I never discovered any Design of aggravating Matters on this Occasion. What makes me clear beyond all Doubt in this Matter, is, that I, that very Day reduced into Writing, the Messages, which I delivered, from your *Lordship* and Mr. *Crips*, with the Answers which I received, and declared that Day, before several Persons present at my House, that the Messages and Answers, which

which I then read, were those which I had carried from your *Lordship* to Mr. *Crips*, and from Mr. *Crips* to your *Lordship*, which were as above related by me.

I hope your *Lordship*, will excuse this very long Letter, it has given me a great deal of Trouble, as I did not think it proper to employ another Hand in writing it, but the Vindication of my Character made it necessary.

Your *Lordship* must be sensible, that during this whole Affair, I shewed a zealous Concern, for the Support of your Honour and Jurisdiction, and never failed (tho' unasked) to give you the best Information in my Power, when I apprehended that you were in Danger of taking a wrong Step; and particularly, * * * * *

I could say a great deal more on this Occasion, but think what I have said sufficient, to induce your *Lordship* to do me Justice, in some Shape or other; in Expectation of which, I shall impatiently wait your *Lordship's* Answer,

I am, my LORD,

Your Lordship's

most dutiful

and most obedient

Servant,

PERK. CROFTON.

6 DE 58

F I N I S.

